**THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE**
**GODA RAGHURAM**
And
**THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE**
**S. ANANDA REDDY**

W.P.No. 25326 of 2004

Dated: 10-08-2007

Between:

G. Raja Gopal Naidu

…Petitioner

And

The Registrar (Administration),
High Court of Andhra Pradesh,
Hyderabad and others.

…Respondents

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE
GODA RAGHURAM
And
THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE
S. ANANDA REDDY

W.P.No. 25326 of 2004

Oral Order: (Per: The Hon'ble Sri justice Goda Raghuram)

The petitioner, a Junior Assistant in the Kurnool district unit of the Judicial department submitted a representation in 2003 to the second respondent claiming

seniority over the third respondent and others in Category-V of Division-IV of Andhra Pradesh Judicial Ministerial Service Rules. The second respondent by an order dated 27-11-2003 rejected the petitioner's representation on several grounds including that the respondent Nos. 3 to 9 against whom seniority is claimed are direct recruits to the post of Junior Assistants or were recruited by transfer from the post of Record Assistant and were regularized earlier. Another reason recorded was that though gradation list was communicated to the employees of all Courts every year showing their seniority, the petitioner having knowledge of his seniority as fixed in the Annual Gradation List since 1987, had not assailed the seniority position as reflected in the successive Annual Gradation Lists.

The appeal preferred by the petitioner to the first respondent against the order of the second respondent was rejected by the order of the first respondent dated 20-08-2004 including on the ground that the representation of the petitioner was belated.

In paragraph No.14 of the affidavit filed in support of the writ petition, the petitioner admits that the gradation lists were communicated to him since the year 1987 but he pleads that he was under the impression that the second respondent would correctly maintain the seniority. This plea though creative does not absolve the petitioner from the laches in approaching for relief. The petitioner is

disentitled to the relief on the ground of delay and laches.

The writ petition is accordingly dismissed. No costs.

_____

GODA RAGHURAM, J

_____

S. ANANDA REDDY, J

Dated: 10-08-2007
Pvks/*